

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE
WESTERN DIVISION**

JESSICA JONES and CHRISTINA
LORENZEN on Behalf of Themselves and
All Others Similarly Situated,

Plaintiffs,

V.

VARSAITY BRANDS, LLC, et al.,

Defendants.

No. 2:20-cv-02892-SHL-tmp

**ORDER GRANTING DEFENDANTS' UNOPPOSED MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE
REPLIES IN SUPPORT OF SUMMARY JUDGMENT IN EXCESS OF PAGE
LIMITATIONS**

Before the Court is Defendants' Unopposed Motion for Leave to File Replies in Support of Summary Judgment in Excess of Page Limitations, filed September 29, 2023. (ECF No. 493.) Defendants ask the Court to allow them to file reply briefs that exceed the page limits set forth in Local Rule 56.1. (*Id.*)

On July 11, 2023, the Court issued an order setting page allowances for Defendants’ anticipated motion for summary judgment and Plaintiffs’ response. (ECF No. 465.) Given the need to present arguments impacting all Defendants along with others impacting certain individual Defendants, Defendants proposed—and the Court reluctantly allowed—the filing of five memoranda of law: (1) a joint memorandum filed on behalf of all seven Defendants, (2) a memorandum filed by Bain Capital Private Equity, (3) a memorandum filed by Charlesbank Capital Partners, (4) a memorandum filed by U.S. All Star Federation, Inc., and (5) a memorandum filed by Jeff Webb. These legal memoranda in support of their motion for summary judgment were to be no longer than one hundred pages in total, along with fifty pages of statements of material fact, allocated across the filings as Defendants saw fit. Plaintiffs were

similarly granted permission to file “[r]esponses of equal total length, allocated as determined necessary by Plaintiffs.” (Id. at PageID 18263.)

Defendants now seek permission to allocate a total of fifty pages across their multiple reply briefs. According to Defendants, these page allowances are justified given the complexity of the case, which involves six causes of action across roughly thirty states and multiple product and geographic markets. (ECF No. 493 at PageID 31847.) Defendants argue that flexibility in allocating pages across these briefs will allow them to present necessary responses to Plaintiffs’ opposition submissions in the most efficient manner.

Given the lack of opposition, and with the hope that this proposal will result in simplified briefing, the Court **GRANTS** the motion. However, Defendants must make every reasonable effort to address the issues on a joint basis and be as efficient in their writing as possible. They must also be direct and explicit as to which responses are raised on an individual basis and which are raised on a joint basis.

IT IS SO ORDERED, this 2nd day of October, 2023.

s/ Sheryl H. Lipman
SHERYL H. LIPMAN
CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE